



COORDINATING JOB DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING IN MISSOURI



An Issues Report from the
Missouri Job Training
Coordinating Council

December 1987

MISSOURI JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COUNCIL

Business

J. C. Benage, President & Chairman
of the Board
United Savings and Loan Association

***Barbara Carroll**, Secretary-Treasurer
Pipe Fabricators, Inc.

Ken Christgen, Jr., Vice-President
Walnut Products, Inc.

***Bill House, Jr.**, President
House Construction Co., Inc.

***Mysie Keene**, Realtor Associate
Blanchard Realty Co.

Jack McCarthy, President
Chem-Free Water Technologies, Inc.

Janice C. Schuerman, Vice-President of
Corporate and Member Services
MFA Inc.

Warren T. Snover, Director of the
Human Resources Department
National Benevolent Association

***Jan C. Tupper**, Senior Project Director
Allgeier, Martin & Associates, Inc.

***John Walker**, Senior Vice-President
of Corporate and Information Services
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of K.C.

Local Government

Randy Best, Treasurer
Clark County

The Honorable H. C. Compton
Presiding Commissioner
Greene County

Betty Gregoire, Assessor
Platte County

Mike Johnson, Public Administrator
Ripley County

Larry Webber, Mayor
Mexico, Missouri

General Public

Samuel Marshall, Associate Minister
Metropolitan Missionary Baptist Church

Local College

***Joseph Daniels**, Director of
Vocational & Adult Education
Carrollton AVTS

William J. Mann, Chancellor
Metropolitan Community Colleges

***Dr. Donald Shook**, President
St. Charles County Community College

Community-Based Organization

Doris Jones, Vice-President of
Community Programs
Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis, Inc.

Labor

George P. Clark, Representative
St. Louis Carpenters District
Council Local Union 1310

Daniel J. "Duke" McVey, President
Missouri State Labor Council

Clinton Ramsey, Consultant
Operating Engineers Local 101

State

Bob Bartmann, Commissioner of Education
Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

***C. Bruce Cornett**, Director
Division of Employment Security

Carl Koupal, Jr., Director
Department of Economic Development

Tom Sullivan, Deputy Director
Department of Economic Development

General Assembly

The Honorable Bob Griffin
Speaker of the House

The Honorable John Bass
Missouri Senate

**Member of the Coordinated Service Delivery Issue Group*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	<i>page 6</i>
II.	The Need for Coordination	<i>page 8</i>
III.	Building Effective Coordination	<i>page 11</i>
IV.	Facilitating Coordination	<i>page 12</i>
	A. Structural/Organizational Factors	
	B. Procedural Mechanisms	
	C. Interpersonal Considerations	
V.	Coordination Issues in the SDAs	<i>page 15</i>
	A. Intake, Assessment, Referral	
	B. Job Development	
	C. Statewide Programs	
	D. JTPA and Employment Security	
	E. JTPA and Area Vocational Technical Schools	
	F. JTPA and Family Services	
	G. JTPA and Adult Basic Education	
	H. Employment Security and Area Vocational Technical Schools	
	I. JTPA Contractors	
	J. Management Information System	
	K. Incentives and Performance Standards	
	L. Private Industry Councils	
VI.	Current Coordination Criteria	<i>page 21</i>
	A. Labor Market Information	
	B. Economic Development	
	C. Labor Exchange	
	D. Program Coordination	
	E. Use of Existing Services and Facilities	
	F. Vocational Education	
	G. Farmers/Rural Development	

KEY ABBREVIATIONS

AEs	Administrative Entities	DJDT	Division of Job Development and Training
DED	Department of Economic Development	DOSS	Department of Social Services
DES	Division of Employment Security	MJTCC	Missouri Job Training Coordinating Council
DESE	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act
DFS	Division of Family Services	PICs	Private Industry Councils
		SDAs	Service Delivery Areas

PREFACE

This report was prepared by the Department of Public Administration, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Missouri-Columbia at the request of the Missouri Division of Job Development and Training on behalf of the Missouri Job Training Council. The goal of the study was to produce an analysis of existing patterns of coordination, identify barriers to successful coordination, identify opportunities for improvement, and recommend strategies to be followed at the state and substate level to encourage coordination.

The report is based on a review of relevant documents and interviews with more than 100 individuals involved in the administration of the JTPA program. After initial discussions with the Coordination Issue Group of the MJTCC, we gathered basic information from the Division of Job Training and Development. We then interviewed officials in the Division of Employment Security and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to determine how state agencies coordinate their activities with each other. On the basis of information gathered to that point, we developed an interview instrument that we used to conduct interviews in every service delivery area. We conducted those interviews with administrative entity directors, private industry council members, area vocational technical school officials, Employment Security office managers, and various organizations that contract with SDAs to deliver services, including regional planning commissions, community action agencies, rural development corporations, the Urban League, labor federations, school officials, and others. In each instance, we sought information about how the organizations coordinate their activities with each other, coordination problems they had encountered, and successful strategies they had developed to coordinate activities.

The report provides a picture of coordination in Missouri and raises a set of issues for officials in the job development and training system to address. Because the study was intended to identify issues and potential problem areas, discuss patterns of coordination, and develop recommendations for effective coordination, we sought a great deal of information about how the program actually operates around the state. We wanted a picture of the system that would be rich in detail and comprehensive in scope. For this reason, we relied on intensive interviews rather than surface data about how current criteria are being met.

This approach allowed us to learn a great deal about what works well and what works poorly in Missouri. It enabled us to identify factors that

facilitate coordination and factors that stand as barriers to effective coordination. Because of the nature of the study, however, we do not present a statistical profile of coordination. The material does not lend itself to that kind of treatment. To put it in the contemporary jargon of public administration research, this is a qualitative, rather than a quantitative study.

The study does not identify the SDAs in which particular problems exist or the specific organizations that are having less success in their efforts to coordinate job development and training activities. To report that information would violate the assurances of confidentiality that we offered interviewees. It would also violate the purpose of the report which was to provide information to guide policy and program development, rather than to serve as a monitoring instrument.

Those who would like to use the report to improve their portion of the system are generally familiar with the coordination problems that affect them. They also have the ability to quickly identify places where the program is not working as effectively as it should. With the information contained in the study, their current knowledge, and their ability to gather further information, they should be in a good position to effectuate change.

Edward T. Jennings, Jr., Ph.D.
Jay D. White, Ph.D.

 College of
Business and
Public Administration
University of Missouri-Columbia

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Coordination of job development and training in Missouri varies considerably across SDAs. It also varies with respect to statewide programs. There are instances of outstanding coordination and examples of terrible coordination. On the whole, there is considerable room for improvement across the state. That improvement will depend upon the various actors in the job development and training system working together to enhance service delivery.

The Missouri Job Training Coordinating Council, the private industry councils, state agencies, administrative entities, and other organizations involved in the JTPA program have developed functioning coordination systems and useful coordination criteria. It is now time to take the next step to enhance program effectiveness through improved coordination. All too often, organizations are either working at cross purposes or duplicating each other's activities.

The study revealed a variety of means by which effective coordination of job development and training activities can be fostered. These include:

- integration of service delivery
- use of shared office space
- use of associate PIC membership
- geographic organization of service providers
- clear definition and differentiation of the roles of service providers
- regular meetings among involved organizations
- frequent interaction among service providers
- effective use of the PIC
- negotiations over particular projects
- effective leadership
- skills at interpersonal relations
- shared understandings
- shared role definitions
- shared knowledge

In addition to identifying these general mechanisms by which coordination can be enhanced, we have developed specific recommendations directed toward specific problems that emerged in the course of the study. The report also makes recommendations with respect to the current coordination criteria contained in the Governor's Special Services and Coordinated Plan. Those recommendations are explained and presented in greater length in the report, but the following material summarizes the recommendations.

- Each SDA should develop agreement among the various service providers to increase coordination of intake, assessment, and referral.
- More extensive efforts should be undertaken to coordinate job development activities.
- Statewide programs should be more effectively coordinated with SDA programs by providing PICs and AEs greater opportunities to shape the use of statewide funds within their SDA.
- The state should retain control of certain statewide funds in the area of

customized training in order to coordinate JTPA activities with the state's economic development efforts.

- Where possible, JTPA and Employment Security should integrate their intake, assessment, and referral processes.
- SDAs and ES local offices should closely coordinate job development activities, including making joint presentations to employers where possible.
- Coordination with area vocational technical schools should be improved by working with AVTS directors to encourage AVTS involvement in the program.
- Plans that appropriately incorporate adult basic education in JTPA should be developed with clear specification of the role that adult basic education is to play in the program.
- Additional area vocational technical schools and Employment Security offices should explore cooperative placement activities.
- Coordination among contractors should be encouraged by clearly defining each contractor's role and responsibilities and using various mechanisms that will facilitate coordination of contractor activity.
- The Division of Family Services should quickly determine how JTPA benefits are to be treated in relation to AFDC and food stamp eligibility and issue clear instructions on this to county offices and JTPA service providers.
- The incentive structure and performance measures of components of the job training system should be examined to assess their effects on coordination. Recommendation for change should follow such examination.
- The MIS system should be reviewed to determine whether it is consistent with current technology and meets the needs of the SDAs as well as state officials. Appropriate training in its use should be offered.
- The Missouri Occupational Coordinating Committee should improve its capacity to provide SDA specific data.
- The Department of Economic Development should extend its efforts to inform PICs and AEs about the state's economic development efforts and AEs should maintain regular contact with economic development agencies in their area.
- Where Employment Security is not providing intake and assessment services for the JTPA program, automated registration should be expanded to provide complete registration.
- Administrative entities and major service providers should be designated to provide Targeted Job Tax Credit certification and vouchers.

- Allow SDAs to demonstrate efforts to provide program coordination in a variety of ways rather than requiring semi-annual meetings.
- Foster the role of the PIC as an active component in the coordination process.

THE NEED FOR COORDINATION

The need for coordination is generated not only by the complexity of the Job Training Partnership Act, but also by the many actors involved in job training and development activities independently of JTPA. The Job Training Partnership Act provides a complex set of programmatic relationships. Administratively, the act has led to the creation in Missouri of (1) the Division of Job Development and Training (DJDT) in the Department of Economic Development to handle state level administration of the program and (2) fifteen service delivery areas (SDAs) with their private industry councils (PICs) and administrative entities (AEs) to handle local administration of the program. The AEs may deliver services themselves or contract with others to provide services. The SDAs are not line extensions of the Division of Job Training and Development and possess considerable programmatic autonomy.

JTPA contains a variety of program components that complicate administration and foster a need for coordination. First, there are the Title II programs for adults and youth that are administered by the AEs with funds that are received by the AEs on a formula basis. Second, there are a variety of "statewide" programs administered by the Division of Job Development and Training (DJDT) on the basis of specific provisions of the law. These include: (1) customized training under the 8 percent coordination funds of Title I, Sec. 123 and Sec 202(b)(1); (2) the older workers program of Sec. 124 and Sec. 202(b)(2); and (3) the displaced worker program of Title III. As a result of these provisions, multiple programs can operate in an area, only some of which are directly controlled by the PIC and AE responsible for the area. The statewide funds are awarded on the basis of either requests for proposals or sole source contracts and are often awarded to agencies other than the administrative entity for a service delivery area.

JTPA is not the only legislation that provides for job training and development activities. Numerous other laws have created programs and administrative agencies that are directly concerned with job training and development. The Wagner-Peyser Act, for example, is administered by the Missouri Division of Employment Security. The major activities carried out under this legislation include a program of unemployment insurance for eligible workers and a job service to help link potential employees with employers. In addition to its basic responsibilities under the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Division of Employment Security and its local offices have undertaken a variety of job training activities over the years, including job clubs, training programs, and customized training.

Vocational education is provided by local school districts through area vocational technical schools under provisions of state law. In addition, local vocational schools may receive funding for vocational training under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Community colleges also provide various programs of vocational education that are related to JTPA concerns and activities.

The state provides support for local school districts to operate programs of adult basic education to meet the needs of those adults who are not sufficiently educated to function effectively in contemporary society. Such education is sometimes needed before an individual can successfully participate in the labor market or in training and placement programs designed to facilitate the operation of the labor market. The Adult Education Act provides federal funding for adult basic education to supplement state and local efforts in this area.

Other federal laws provide further support for job training and development or permit (require) the participants of other public programs to take part in job training and development activities. These laws include the Social Security Act, Title IV; Trade Act of 1974—Chapter 2; National Apprenticeship Act; Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Chapter 1, Part IV)—Targeted Jobs Tax Credit; Higher Education Act of 1965; Older Americans Act of 1965; Veterans Job Training Act; Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

There are a large number of actors involved in job training and development in Missouri as a result of state and federal programs and policies. All have something to offer and all relate to JTPA in one way or another.

There are a large number of actors involved in job training and development in Missouri as a result of state and federal programs and policies. All have something to offer and all relate to JTPA in one way or another. The most important of these for purposes of coordinating job training and development at the state level are the Division of Job Development and Training of the Department of Economic Development (DED), the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), particularly its vocational education components, the Division of Family Services (DFS) and the Division of Aging in the Department of Social Services (DOSS), and the Division of Employment Security (DES) in the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations. In addition to traditional vocational education programs, the Division of Career and Adult Education in DESE has conducted a customized training program called the Industry Training Program, supported with state funds.

At the local level, administrative entities interact with local employment security offices (52), area vocational technical schools (58), adult basic education programs, county offices of the Division of Family Services (115), community action agencies, community colleges, regional planning commissions, economic development agencies, area agencies on aging, and others. In addition to the possibility that each of these will be a service provider under JTPA, there are numerous other organizations that contract to provide JTPA services. For example, the Greater Kansas City Building and Construction Trades Council conducts a job search assistance program in Kansas City, an international accounting firm operates a skill training program in St. Louis, and the Easter Seal Society operates an on the job training program.

These many actors and programs constitute the

job training and development system in Missouri. It is not a system in the sense of a highly integrated set of components directed toward well defined goals and objectives. It is a system in the sense of a set of inter-related activities that are loosely coordinated in the pursuit of sometimes shared goals and purposes. The actors have diverse goals and objectives, only some of which match. Dictates of organizational growth and preservation introduce tension into the system, as do diverse perspectives on the best means of pursuing job training and development objectives.

In thinking about this system and efforts to coordinate its component parts, it is important to remember that its various components differ in their histories, missions, objectives, and constituencies. The employment security system exists to provide unemployment insurance benefits to eligible individuals and to link job ready individuals with employers. The vocational education system was created to provide standard vocational education to a youthful student population that originated in the secondary school system. Income maintenance programs were created to help families and individuals in need of basic economic sustenance. JTPA and its predecessors were created to meet the job training needs of those who were poorly served by the existing array of institutions—individuals who had not received an adequate education to survive in the labor market, persons who were displaced by economic change, people who did not fit the mold of job ready individuals sought by employers listing positions with the job service of Employment Security.

JTPA and its predecessors were created to meet the job training needs of those who were poorly served by the existing array of institutions.

The result is an array of organizations and programs that contain quite diverse components and perspectives on job training and development. To those with an economic development orientation, the key to a successful program might be the attraction of new industry to an area or the creation of new economic activity. To those with a social service orientation the key to success might be found in programs addressed toward changing the individual client so that he or she will adapt to the world of work. To educators, the key is to be found in successful skill training programs and academic achievement.

These different perspectives are accompanied by standard modes of operation. Area vocational schools, for example, are tied to the local educa-

tional system and accustomed to offering semester length courses based on the regular academic year. As another example, the Division of Employment Security is accustomed to having clients seek out its offices to receive services. While it is possible for organizations to change these standard patterns of behavior, it is not always easy.

The differences among the organizations can lead to sharp conflict, with undesirable consequences for job training and development in Missouri. Differences between the Division of Job Development and Training and the Missouri Council of Vocational Administrators over who should be responsible for customized training in Missouri led to defeat last year of a legislative initiative to authorize additional customized training to upgrade jobs with existing employers. This kind of conflict may serve the purposes of competing bureaucracies, but it does little for the overall job training and development system. It undermines economic growth in Missouri and penalizes those in need of job training services.

To deal with the multitude of actors and programs and produce coordination of the diverse activities, JTPA provided for creation of a Missouri Job Training Coordinating Council (MJTCC) and the preparation every two years of a Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan. The governor's plan contains a set of coordination criteria that are supposed to guide job development and training activities at the level of the SDA. Coordination is further facilitated by the composition of the MJTCC and the PICs. Both bring together individuals from private industry and representatives of agencies in the job training and development area to develop policy for the operation of JTPA programs.

As described in the governor's plan, the coordination criteria provide minimal standards believed necessary for SDAs to deliver cost effective programs. The criteria establish both procedural and programmatic requirements for coordination. The current coordination criteria include:

- (1) requirements with respect to the use of labor market information developed by the Missouri Occupational Information Coordinating Council;
- (2) contributions to economic development efforts;
- (3) coordination of placement activities with other agencies;
- (4) efforts to coordinate programs with other agencies;
- (5) use of existing services when possible;
- (6) review of local education agency applications for Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act funds;
- (7) coordination of activities with efforts to help distressed farmers.

BUILDING EFFECTIVE COORDINATION

Methods of improving coordination in the job training and development system in general and JTPA in particular range from drastic structural realignments to modest alterations in existing relationships.

One method of achieving coordination would be to bring all job training and development activity into one organization. The various activities of the job training and development system would be consolidated in that organization. The assumption is that a hierarchical organization would be able to impose control on its subordinate units and thus bring order to the system. This is not necessarily the case, as many large scale organizations have discovered, but it would probably permit some current coordination difficulties to be resolved.

Despite the potential benefits of major restructuring and consolidation, it is not an approach that we can recommend at this time. The system is very complex and consists of many organizations with diverse goals, objectives, and programs. It would be extraordinarily difficult to consolidate all of that in a single organization in a way that would improve coordination while maintaining diverse priorities. Current constituencies of these organizations would surely object and important goals might be lost in the shuffle. Major legislation would be required and we saw no evidence that there is an active constituency for such change. Finally, such as organizational rearrangement has to take into account both local and state level arrangements. It would be such a large organization that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to coordinate its various components closely.

A second approach is to look for improved role definition so that there is a functional differentiation of responsibilities among the various organizations in the job training and development system. This might be accomplished, for example, by assigning all responsibility for job development and placement to Employment Security, all skill training to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and other functions, such as assessment, coordination, and other training to the JTPA organization. This approach is attractive because it would seem to greatly simplify things and several important actors suggested that it might be an appropriate way to go. If followed, it will have to be tailored to the needs of different SDAs.

A third approach is to develop integrated activities at the SDA level. For example, ES and the AE in each SDA could develop practical arrangements to integrate their outreach, intake, and assessment activities, as well as job development efforts. This has the virtue of dealing with major problems while allowing adaptability to local concerns and needs.

Within and in addition to these major approaches, there are a variety of steps that can be taken to improve coordination, as the following discussion indicates.

FACILITATING COORDINATION

Our interviews across the state revealed a variety of factors that seem to facilitate coordination at the SDA level. These include structural/organizational factors, procedural factors, and interpersonal considerations.

Structural/Organizational Factors

The principal structural/organizational factors identified in our interviews included:

- (1) integration of service delivery involving two or more organizations;
- (2) the use of shared office space or shared personnel or the placement of one organization's personnel in another organization's offices for certain periods each week;
- (3) provision of associate membership on the PIC to JTPA related agencies not already represented on the PIC;
- (4) organizing service providers along geographical lines to avoid duplication of services; and
- (5) clearly delineating and differentiating the roles of various organizations.

Integration of service delivery occurs when two or more organizations combine their operations to deliver a service or set of services. The most extensive example of this in Missouri is developing in Kansas City where SDA 3 and the Division of Employment Security are developing a joint operation of some magnitude. ES and the Full Employment Council are operating out of the same office. ES is providing intake, assessment, and referral as well as undertaking some OJT. ES and FEC are undertaking joint job development and sharing the use of the Employment Security job bank. In effect, the resources of both organizations are being closely coordinated in a way that ought to produce substantial benefits. FEC will benefit from the expertise and organizational base that ES can bring to bear, and ES will benefit from FEC resources, personnel, and client base.

We witnessed several instances in which JTPA operators are placed in ES offices on a regular basis in order to facilitate service delivery. This also has the effect of increasing coordination between ES and JTPA, particularly in terms of referrals and information sharing. At least one PIC provides related agencies with associate membership on the PIC. This action takes into account the fact that PICs are structured to provide representation to diverse groups in order to obtain a wide range of ideas and views for decision making and extends that representational character of the PIC. The result is to increase the sense of shared commitment to JTPA activities.

There are a number of SDAs that use multiple service providers but organize those service providers along geographic lines. This helps disperse service delivery and make it more accessible to potential clients in rural areas while ensuring that service providers are not interfering with each other or duplicating services unnecessarily.

Where multiple service providers operate in the same area, there are significant risks of service duplication, uncoordinated job development, and poor service to clients brought on by competition. For example, we interviewed service providers who would not share information about available jobs with other service providers, even when they had no immediate need for the jobs for their own clients, because they wanted to bank the jobs against future needs. In addition, we

interviewed service providers who described situations in which other service providers “stole” their employers.

These problems can be successfully resolved. One of the principal mechanisms that Missouri SDAs have discovered for this purpose is to clearly delineate and differentiate the roles of different service providers. It might be agreed, for example, that one service provider will work with job ready clients while another will focus on those who are not job ready. The keys to success in this situation are clearly defined roles with shared role expectations among the various actors. It is also important that common assessment practices be followed by the different program operators if assessment is not centralized. In addition, some attention needs to be given to the incentive structure facing service providers and the creation of incentives to share.

Where multiple service providers operate in the same area, there are significant risks of service duplication, uncoordinated job development, and poor service to clients brought on by competition.

Coordination among subcontractors can be greatly enhanced if attention is paid to potential coordination issues in the planning stages leading to the writing of RFPs. Some SDAs are just now learning this as they become more familiar with the JTPA program. Other SDAs are successful with this due to long term experience with job training and development.

Procedural Mechanisms

Procedural mechanisms for coordination that are used by Missouri SDAs include:

- (1) regular meetings among involved organizations;
- (2) frequent interaction;
- (3) effective use of the PIC; and
- (4) negotiations over particular projects.

Regular meetings can take several forms. They vary considerably among Missouri SDAs. While some reported success with the bi-annual meeting of service providers, others found that requirement to be ineffective and unnecessary. Instead, they met on a regular basis with related organizations in other forums. Others reported that they were able to work out coordination in the course of frequent interactions that occur in a variety of settings for a variety of reasons. The key here seems to be keeping in touch and clearing bases with affected parties.

While structuring the PIC to increase interaction and involvement is a useful approach, it is also

true that the extent to which the PIC can contribute to coordination depends on the way in which the PIC operates and the expectations of its members and the administrative entity. Even without additional representation, the PIC contains a cross section of important actors who can help coordinate the activities of diverse organizations. For that to happen, they have to be encouraged to act in that manner.

In some PICs, negotiations over particular projects provide a mechanism for coordination. For example, in one PIC various organizations are brought together in advance when a project is to be initiated with a major employer. They decide which agency will take the lead on the project and provide for other agencies to “buy in” to the contract between that agency and the business firm. This technique is frequently used in the St. Louis area to allow each of the three SDAs there to participate in projects and coordinate their efforts rather than fighting with each other.

Interpersonal Considerations

Finally, we have a set of interpersonal factors that seem to be important to effective coordination, including:

- (1) leadership and relations among leaders;
- (2) skills at interpersonal relations;
- (3) shared understandings;
- (4) shared role definitions;
- (5) and shared knowledge.

Leadership is the most important of these, but it often builds upon and includes these other characteristics.

Coordination is facilitated when organizations, through their leaders, develop shared role expectations. In other words, they develop common expectations of what each party will contribute.

Effective leaders are adroit at shaping the attention of other members of the system. They can point out opportunities and possibilities that might not otherwise be considered. They recognize situations in which joint action produces joint benefit for the organizations while serving the interests of clients and build upon that recognition, helping others to do so also.

Also important to effective leadership between organizations is a concern for planning and the ability to translate plans into operational programs. The ability to anticipate coordination problems in the planning stage is an important ingredient in avoiding actual coordination problems once contracts are awarded.

Effective leaders are knowledgeable. They understand their own organization and program well and they have considerable knowledge of other components of the system. They put this knowledge to work in developing exchanges with other components of the system.

Leaders of organizations interact effectively together when they develop a relationship that allows them to see each other's problems and build patterns of mutual support. They recognize how the interaction of their organizations can contribute to the success of activities and take steps to promote that interaction. They build a relationship that promotes exchanges of ideas and focuses on programmatic success.

Skill at interpersonal relations involves the ability to understand the needs and problems of other persons and communicate effectively. It involves the building of trust and is based on the development of shared understandings.

Coordination is facilitated when organizations, through their leaders, develop shared role expectations. In other words, they develop common expectations of what each party will contribute. These common expectations are based on shared knowledge of the JTPA system and of each other's operations. That knowledge helps shape expectations and makes it possible to see opportunities for coordination.

Finally, the personal and interpersonal dimensions of coordination involve the capacity to change and be innovative. They involve a willingness to go beyond accustomed routines and experiment with new ways of doing things.

COORDINATION ISSUES IN THE SDAs

Coordination issues in Missouri can take several forms and exist at various levels of organization. Coordination is necessary at the state level among different agencies and programs of the Department of Economic Development, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations. At the service delivery level, coordination is necessary among the many agencies and organizations involved in the job training and development system. Coordination concerns include intake, assessment and referral, job development, placement, skill training, and other activities.

JTPA requires both vertical and horizontal coordination. Vertical coordination refers to coordination between statewide programs and programs operated by the PICs. Horizontal coordination refers to coordination among the actors at one level of government. This can mean coordination between the AE and other agencies (ES, AVTS, DFS, etc.) at the local level. It can also mean coordination of JTPA service providers contracted by the AE. Horizontal coordination is also needed among state agencies, since DJDT, ES, DESE, and DFS all have job development and training responsibilities.

Intake, Assessment, Referral

There is a great deal of variety among the SDAs in the extent to which intake, assessment, and referral (IAR) are coordinated. In a number of SDAs intake, assessment, and referral have not been consolidated and there is duplication of assessment and counseling. There is a strong likelihood that assessment is not well coordinated across service providers when there are multiple providers, particularly when each provider is responsible for recruiting participants itself. Such duplication is less likely if service providers cover geographically distinct areas.

ES and JTPA service providers typically duplicate each other in this respect. Automatic registration does not work because it is only partial and neither ES nor JTPA operators express much confidence in the system. Consequently, intake has to be duplicated for many clients so that they will be successfully registered with both Employment Security and the JTPA program.

Referral networks vary among the SDAs with extensive referrals between various actors in some SDAs and limited or no referrals in others. The use of referrals seems to work best where the organizations interact on a range of matters and have a good working relationship. In other words, if coordination in general is good, then the pattern of referrals is likely to be active. If the organizations share offices or have personnel in each other's offices on a regular basis, referrals are likely to be good. Where the pattern of interaction on other matters is weak, referrals are likely to be weak.

In SDAs with a consolidated operation and essentially a single service provider, intake, assessment and referral are clearly more easily coordinated, almost by definition. Even in those SDAs, however, steps could be taken to improve coordination of these activities with related agencies such as Employment Security and area vocational schools. Where statewide programs operate independently of the SDA, mechanisms should be in place to coordinate intake, assessment, and referral. The specialized clientele of some statewide programs (e.g., older workers, displaced workers) reduces the need for coordination of these activities, but does not eliminate it since the same clientele may be eligible for other JTPA

services and clientele eligible for one program may show up at an organization running another program.

The existence of multiple service providers and dispersed intake, assessment, and referral does not have to mean a lack of coordination. With agreement on assessment and referral standards, this can be an effective, efficient mode of service delivery, particularly in rural SDAs where it might prove costly to have a single, consolidated IAR process.

The existence of multiple service providers and dispersed intake, assessment, and referral does not have to mean a lack of coordination.

RECOMMENDATION

Each SDA should develop agreements among the various service providers that will increase coordination of intake, assessment, and referral processes. Such agreements should reduce the burden on recipients and the degree to which organizations need to duplicate work. The organizations to be involved in coordinated IAR will vary depending on the organization of job training and development activities in an SDA and the extent to which non-JTPA agencies will participate in cooperative agreements.

RECOMMENDATION

Steps should be taken to reduce the need for JTPA clients to register with multiple agencies. The coordinated IAR process should accomplish registration with appropriate agencies. This means, specifically, that means should be found to make automated registration with Employment Security effective.

Job Development

There is evidence that job development activities are poorly coordinated in a number of SDAs. The efforts of JTPA service providers are not coordinated and there is poor coordination between statewide and SDA efforts. In addition, there is often very little coordination between JTPA, Employment Security, AVTS, and others. There are SDAs where multiple contacts with employers are considered to be a problem. Other SDAs either have few program operators and, thus, less likelihood that this will be a problem, or they have worked out arrangements to reduce the extent of multiple contacts. In addition to multiple contacts with employers, poor coordination of job development means there is inadequate planning and a failure to combine efforts where appropriate.

There are a variety of means by which coordination of job development can be secured. Those

include contracting, formal non-financial agreements, planning sessions, and regular interaction and discussion. Informal agreements can play a significant role.

RECOMMENDATION

JTPA service providers and related agencies should reexamine their efforts to coordinate job development activities. Coordination clauses, such as those in statewide contracts, should be vigorously implemented.

Statewide Programs

There are major problems in the coordination of statewide programs with SDA programs. There were numerous complaints from service providers and administrative entities that statewide programs are not adequately coordinated with their activities. Even on this, however, there are mixed results. Several SDAs reported no difficulty coordinating activities with statewide efforts and several that complained about current arrangements appeared to believe it was a problem in other areas, but not in their own district. For many AE directors, it is a control issue. Coordination between statewide and SDA programs is facilitated when the statewide program operator is an SDA contractor or the SDA itself.

Two problems result from inadequate coordination of the statewide efforts with local activities. The first is programmatic—program effectiveness is reduced and duplication of effort occurs. The second is employer related—employers receive different and sometimes conflicting offers of service and express confusion and resentment about being approached by multiple actors to participate in multiple JTPA programs. The confusion is compounded by the fact that the term customized training can refer to locally based programs from the SDA's entitlement funds, statewide programs funded with JTPA money, or a statewide program funded from general revenues which does not have the same eligibility requirements. In fact, both DJDT and DESE operate statewide customized training programs from general revenue funds. The advertising for these programs apparently leads some employers to think there are no restrictions on any customized training funds. All of this gives JTPA the image of being an inefficiently run government program, just the image of earlier job training efforts that policy makers had hoped to avoid with JTPA.

Although complaints about inadequate coordination with statewide programs are significant, it has to be pointed out that some confusion is inevitable given the array of job training and development programs and that mechanisms for coordinating statewide efforts with local activities are available. There are several ways in which statewide

programs can be coordinated with local activities currently. First, all SDAs are encouraged to compete for statewide grants through the RFP process. Some do this, are awarded contracts, and are in a position of being able to directly coordinate statewide with local activity. Second, all statewide program contracts contain provisions within the scope of work requiring program operators to coordinate their activities with the PIC in the area in which they operate. Third, PICs have been able to work out satisfactory coordination arrangements with statewide program operators. For example, several PICs in the St. Louis area indicated that they had arrangements to coordinate activities with the displaced worker program operated by the community college system. Finally, the state can award sole source contracts to local government entities rather than awarding the funds on an RFP basis. Thus, when the AE is an agency of a local government, statewide contracts could be awarded directly. However, although the state does have several sole source contracts for statewide programs, it is not clear that these are done to enhance coordination. Nor have all local agency AEs been offered control of statewide programs in this way.

Despite problems of coordination, it is true that important values are served by the statewide programs, such as the economic development goals of the state. It is quite reasonable for the state to want to retain control of customized training funds to support its economic development efforts. This is reinforced by the need to market economic development tools, such as customized training, beyond the boundaries of individual SDAs.

RECOMMENDATION

A means should be found to give the PICs and AEs a central role in statewide programs. The simplest way to do this would be to award some of the statewide funds to SDAs on a formula basis. If legal barriers to this cannot be overcome, other ways of effectively coordinating statewide programs with SDA plans should be found. One possibility would be to require all proposals to be coordinated with the PIC prior to award of a contract. If funding is turned over to the SDAs, a staff person should be retained at DJDT to work with the SDAs on programs that cross SDA boundaries or on programs that are of sufficient magnitude as to warrant special attention (e.g.: Chrysler or GM). Customized training funds should be retained at the state level to support statewide economic development activities. These efforts can be coordinated with the SDAs in some of the ways already discussed.

JTPA and Employment Security

There is an extraordinarily complex pattern of interaction and coordination between JTPA and Employment Security. At the SDA level, it ranges

from a substantial integration of activities that is developing in one SDA to outright hostility in some areas. In some SDAs, coordination is very strong and both parties benefit from a synergistic relationship. In others, ES and JTPA hardly speak to each other, much less coordinate their activities. It is even more complex than this, however, because the relationship can vary considerably within an SDA, with strong coordination between the AE and one ES office accompanied by very weak coordination between the AE and another ES office.

In some SDAs, referrals between ES and JTPA are weak to non-existent, although almost all SDAs report efforts to use either automated registration with ES or to get their clients to report in person to ES. Many administrative entities report receiving very few direct referrals from Employment Security, and several ES directors indicated that they can do little more than make some information about JTPA available to job applicants. Most SDAs reported that automatic registration is unsatisfactory, partly because it is only partial, partly because clients do not receive much help from ES unless they report there in person. Thus, there is regular duplication of processing. In addition, in many SDAs it appears that there are very few placements of JTPA clients by ES. However, ES can produce data indicating that it regularly places JTPA eligible individuals in jobs.

Job development is another area in which there could be considerable improvement in coordination between JTPA and ES. While Employment Security offices and JTPA administrative entities and service providers have developed cooperative job development efforts in several SDAs, there are others where they proceed quite independently of each other. This sometimes means duplication of effort and probably reduces the effectiveness of job development efforts.

Related to job development is the use of the Employment Security job bank. Employment Security is rightfully concerned about maintaining the integrity of its relationship with employers who list jobs with the job bank, and this has led ES to be cautious about providing others access to its job listings. Despite this, ways should and can be found to link the JTPA program to the ES job bank. Doing this helps JTPA clients and program operators, but it also helps Employment Security which currently fails to fill 35,000 or more positions that are listed with it each year.

We received a number of complaints that ES offices would not share information about available positions or let JTPA operators see the job listings. On the other hand, several SDAs have worked out relationships with ES that provide very direct access to its job listings. SDA 3 in Kansas City is moving the most in this direction with its contractual relationship with ES that will have ES and the JTPA program operating out of the same office and will

lead to cooperative job development and shared use of job listings. Others that have not moved this far have, none-the-less, found ways to share information about job listings and cooperate in job development, dividing responsibilities and making joint presentations to employers.

RECOMMENDATION

While formal agreements and contractual relationships can be important components of coordination between ES and JTPA, it is clear that effective leadership is crucial. In case after case, it was evident that the attitudes and actions of the ES office manager and the JTPA director determine the degree to which coordination will take place. When they recognize the joint benefit that flows from cooperation and coordination and make the effort to make it happen, it does. Where their attitudes are not conducive or they fail to take appropriate actions, coordination will not occur.

Coordination is stronger when an Employment Security office contracts to provide services to an administrative entity. It is also stronger when the AE or program operator has intake people who work out of the ES office part of the time. In rural areas, the distance to ES offices can be a problem. A contractual relationship seems to help not only because of resource transfers that may take place, but because of the authority it provides and the clarity it can produce. It can make certain kinds of support possible that might not otherwise be possible.

RECOMMENDATION

Where possible, JTPA and Employment Security should integrate their intake, assessment, and referral processes. One way to encourage this is to establish contractual relationships between JTPA and ES, but other approaches can also contribute. SDAs and ES local offices should closely coordinate job development activities, including making joint presentations to employers where possible. Ways should be found to more extensively share ES job bank information with JTPA service providers.

JTPA and Area Vocational Technical Schools

As in other areas, coordination between JTPA and area vocational schools varies across the state. In some SDAs, there is a very effective working relationship, with the AVTS meeting the skill training needs of the JTPA program and regular referrals between the AVTS and the JTPA program operator(s). In others, the area vocational schools play a role, but there may be a way to improve coordination to meet the needs of the different actors. In still others, the area vocational schools appear to have little or no relationship with the program. This is particularly true in the major metropolitan areas

where the administrative entities seem to rely much more on proprietary schools and community colleges than on area vocational schools for skill training. In more rural areas and some of the smaller cities, the relationship between AVTS and JTPA seems to be stronger.

Where the relationship is weak to nonexistent, the one factor that showed up in interviews was inflexibility on the part of area vocational schools as perceived by JTPA operators. The administrative entities in some areas said the vocational schools simply were not flexible in what they were willing to offer or how they were willing to offer it and wanted to go with their own definition of what is needed instead of accepting the decisions of the PICs and AEs. For example, some vocational technical schools are unwilling to offer skill areas sought by SDAs; others are unwilling to develop "open entry/open exit" classes or summer classes. By the same token, SDAs are not always willing to provide financial guarantees for the arrangements they would like to have, such as might be accomplished through a class size contract.

RECOMMENDATION

Coordination with area vocational technical schools can be improved in the SDAs by educating AVTS directors about the role and function of JTPA. Where appropriate, the AVTS should serve as contractors either directly with the PIC or through subcontracts with other service providers. PICs and AVTS should be encouraged to further coordinate their training and job development activities. Steps should be taken to encourage area vocational schools to get out of the "academic year mind set" and develop more flexible programs for JTPA. SDAs should develop ways of facilitating flexibility on the part of area vocational technical schools.

JTPA and Family Services

Two coordination issues arose in our discussions of the relationship between JTPA and the Division of Family Services. First, some JTPA program operators find it difficult to obtain timely verification from DFS offices that clients are receiving AFDC or food stamps. Perhaps more importantly, DFS offices give different interpretations of how JTPA income is to be treated in determining benefit levels of AFDC and food stamp recipients. It was reported to us that DFS is investigating this matter.

RECOMMENDATION

The question of how different types of JTPA benefits should be treated in relation to AFDC and food stamp eligibility and benefit levels should be determined quickly by the Division of Family Ser-

VICES with clear instructions issued to county offices. Those instructions should be widely shared with JTPA service providers.

Administrative entities and DFS county offices should work together to develop procedures to insure timely provision of AFDC and food stamp eligibility information.

JTPA and Adult Basic Education

Adult Basic Education is poorly integrated with JTPA across the state. There was virtually no SDA in which coordination appeared to be strong. The lack of coordination appears to be a product of strong pressures that AEs and program operators feel to keep training short and get people quickly into jobs. ABE directors consistently complained that when they refer individuals to JTPA, they seldom return.

There are coordination issues here, but the basic policy issues are more important and determine whether or not coordination with ABE will take place. While it clearly is important to get people into jobs, the rhetoric and legislative mandate of JTPA stress preparation of clients for life long employment and adequate basic education is important to insure that these clients are not regularly cycling through JTPA and similar programs. Better coordination could help achieve both the short and long term objectives.

The expression of those beliefs in one SDA captures well the differences and suggests the difficulties they create for coordination. The AE director wants to help clients get a job by improving their English and math skills. He does not care about the clients actually getting a GED. His attitude is "job first, GED later." He believes that ABE has the opposite point of view, focusing on academic achievement first and vocational training second and that they don't care about the client's self-esteem. The ABE director agrees that they focus on academic achievement first, but that they also have a strong concern for vocational training. The ABE director also claims that they have a strong concern for the client's self-esteem.

RECOMMENDATION

The role of adult basic education in the JTPA program should be carefully examined in the planning process at both the state and SDA level. Plans that appropriately incorporate adult basic education should be developed with clear specifications of the role that adult basic education is to play in the program. Performance measures and award systems should include appropriate use of adult basic education. JTPA service providers should be held responsible by the PIC or the AE for insuring that appropriate linkages are maintained with adult basic education.

Employment Security and Area Vocational Technical Schools

In some SDAs there is virtually no coordination between ES and AVTS. This is partly due to geographical distances and partly to the personalities of the local ES managers and AVTS directors. Some Employment Security offices and area vocational technical schools have found it beneficial to have an Employment Security placement specialist work out of the AVTS on a regular basis to provide placement services for graduating students.

RECOMMENDATION

Other local ES offices and AVTS should explore cooperative placement activities, including the assignment of an Employment Service placement specialist to work on a regular basis with the AVTS to place graduating students.

JTPA Contractors

Coordination among contractors can be achieved in a variety of ways. Whether it is an issue depends upon the extent to which an SDA contracts with multiple service providers and how it defines the duties and responsibilities of each service provider. In many Missouri SDAs, coordination among service providers is not an issue or problem because service delivery is consolidated largely under a single service provider or service delivery contracts are awarded on a geographic basis.

There are some Missouri SDAs in which coordination among service providers could be considerably improved. There is overlap and duplication of effort among the service providers and they seem to be working at cross purposes. They fail to cooperate and share information. While competition has its beneficial face, it is showing a harmful face in some of these situations. Contractors compete for clients and job placements in ways that are not necessarily in the interest of clients and may undermine the overall job development and placement effort.

RECOMMENDATION

Coordination among contractors can be achieved by clearly defining each contractor's role and responsibilities and spelling that out in the contract's scope of work, creating mechanisms for information sharing and coordinated marketing and recruiting efforts, providing centralized assessment of clients, and other techniques. It is most likely to occur when good working relationships are established on the basis of mutual understanding.

Management Information System

Several SDAs are unhappy with the current MIS system. They complain of the cost to be con-

nected, the relevancy of the reports they must submit, and the turnaround time for getting reports back. Some SDAs report that they are getting better at using the MIS system. Other SDAs report no problems with the MIS because of long term experience with it.

RECOMMENDATION

The MIS system should be reviewed to determine whether it is consistent with current technology and meets the needs of the SDAs as well as state officials. Appropriate training in its use should be offered and SDAs that find it difficult to use the system productively should take advantage of that training.

Incentives and Performance Standards

We encountered numerous instances in which current incentive systems and performance standards hinder coordination and reduce the effectiveness of service delivery. We have already noted that competition among service providers can lead to things like hoarding of clients and job placement opportunities. Because providers are rewarded for the number of clients they process (e.g., job search assistance) and placements in jobs, they find it to be in their short run interest to avoid cooperation and coordination with other providers. We also understand that this affects the relationship between employment security offices and the JTPA program because ES offices do not receive credit in their performance system for certain kinds of placements with the JTPA program.

We were unable to pursue this to develop a thorough analysis of the effects of incentives and performance standards on coordination and service delivery. It is a topic that should receive careful scrutiny because the incentives that face organizations have such a strong bearing on their performance. To the extent that those incentives are reducing coordination, however inadvertently, changes should be sought.

RECOMMENDATION

The incentive structure and performance measures of components of the job training and development system should be examined to assess their effects on coordination. Following such analysis, performance measures and incentive structures should be altered to encourage coordination without harming other important goals.

Private Industry Councils

The Private Industry Councils are not generally considered to be major forces for coordination, but there are exceptions to that. In a couple of SDAs, concerns of the PICs have led to major changes in operations in order to improve coordination. In ad-

dition, at least one SDA has restructured its PIC to create a category of associate membership. This is used to allow all related agencies to participate in PIC meetings. It was reported by the AE director that this gives all agencies a sense of participation, keeps them informed, and helps commit them to SDA activities. It provides a forum to work problems out.

The potential of PICs to foster coordination is undermined by the perception of many actors that the PICs are too political. We heard frequent comments that PIC members often pursue their own self interest or the interest of their agency at the expense of broader values and general JTPA effectiveness. For example, some people believe PIC members exert undue influence on decisions regarding awards to their own agency.

RECOMMENDATION

The PIC should play an active role in fostering coordination of activities. To do this, its members have to be well informed about the JTPA program. A heavy emphasis should be placed on educating PIC members, particularly those who are new to the system, so that they can function effectively in this respect. PICs should develop rules of procedure that will reduce perceptions that members are pursuing personal or agency interests, keeping in mind that such perceptions cannot be completely eliminated given the composition of PICs. Widespread participation in PIC activities should be encouraged.

CURRENT COORDINATION CRITERIA

Labor Market Information

This criterion requires use of labor market information developed by the Missouri Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and data obtained from other sources to insure that the SDA plans training programs only for occupations in demand.

There seem to be some significant problems with the Missouri Occupational Information Coordinating Committee's capacity to provide SDA specific data, both for rural SDAs and for specific SDAs within a metropolitan area. Several SDAs reported this difficulty and felt they needed to look for other data because of the inadequacies of the data provided by MOICC. Comments suggest that there has been improvement in this area, but much remains to be accomplished. Even those SDAs that report successful and regular use of MOICC data indicated that they supplement its data with other information, a practice which seems not only necessary but desirable.

Even when appropriate labor market information is available, its use is spotty at best. Some SDAs are successful in their use of labor market information because they have people who have been using the information for several years and are experienced with it. In other SDAs, the program operators and planners are relatively new to JTPA and are learning how to use labor market information. They report that they are getting better at it, especially with the help given by attending workshops on how to use the information.

RECOMMENDATION

The Missouri Occupational Information Coordinating Committee should improve its ability to provide SDA specific data. Administrative entities and major service providers should avail themselves of opportunities to develop knowledge and skills in the use of labor market information. The use of MOICC should not preclude other efforts by SDAs to develop reliable labor market information.

Economic Development

The SDA is required to expend a minimum of 15 percent of its Title II-A funds on customized training and to coordinate its activities with other statewide or local customized training programs. These requirements presumably help insure coordination of job training efforts with economic development efforts.

The SDAs report diverse results with customized training. While most seem able to meet the target, several complain of difficulty for various reasons. The most prominent of those reasons is economic conditions, with several respondents arguing that an SDA's ability to meet the customized training target is dependent upon whether economic growth is occurring in the SDA. There have also been reports about misunderstandings among employers about customized training. Apparently, some employers have been confused by state advertising to believe that

they will be able to use customized training for any employee, rather than those who are JTPA eligible.

The SDAs vary in the extent to which they coordinate their activities more generally with economic development activities. In general, SDAs that use RPCs as administrative entities or program operators seem to be more adept at this. In addition to these RPCs, there are some other SDAs that have learned that there are a variety of economic development entities in their area and strive to stay in touch with them. Many SDAs report that the Department of Economic Development does not keep them well informed about developments in their area (e.g., award of CDBG grants). Some community action agencies seem to find the notion that JTPA is an economic development program unacceptable; they are less likely to coordinate their programs with economic development activities.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Economic Development should extend its efforts to inform PICs and AEs about economic development activities originating with the state. This could be accomplished with a regular newsletter about general economic development activities and special notices about particular projects. SDAs should carefully survey economic development efforts in their areas and maintain regular contact with economic development agencies (Industrial Development Boards, Chambers of Commerce, etc.)

Labor Exchange

SDAs are required to coordinate placement activities with the local ES office and other job placement agencies. This includes insuring that JTPA participants are registered with ES. To the extent that this coordination is productive, the SDA will be able to devote additional resources to other activities instead of job development and placement.

Automated registration has not succeeded as a coordination tool. The problem is organizational rather than technical. Neither ES nor JTPA operators seem to feel that automated registration provides sufficient information or sufficient contact with ES. That statement can be modified to the extent that SDAs believe it is useless to register the clients with ES, something which is true in at least a couple of SDAs.

The Targeted Jobs Tax Credit receives mixed, but generally positive, reviews. Most SDAs report using it successfully, and most indicated that there are no real problems coordinating with ES for the certification and vouchering of clients. Many do it as an automatic matter of course. The only problems were those that would be typical of any government program (some employers don't like government programs for various reasons) and the fact that several rural SDAs felt clients were reluctant to drive

the distance to the ES office. Several SDAs suggested that it would facilitate service to the client if they could directly certify TJTC eligibility.

RECOMMENDATION

Where ES is not providing intake and assessment services for the JTPA program, automated registration should be expanded to provide complete registration. This will eliminate duplication of effort and simplify matters for JTPA clients.

JTPA AEs and major service providers should be designated to provide TJTC certification. This will simplify things for clients and reduce duplication of effort.

Program Coordination

SDAs are required to convene semi-annual meetings of job training related organizations to address procedures to coordinate applicant and participant referral to and from the SDA, exchange information about related programs, and promote staff interaction. Alternative procedures may be followed to address these concerns. The purpose of this criterion is to insure that diverse programs are coordinated with each other. Thus, activities of the area vocational schools, the local offices of the Division of Employment Security, the Division of Family Services, and the JTPA program are to be coordinated through these semi-annual meetings.

The semi-annual meetings were not viewed everywhere as useful, but they were replaced by a variety of other meetings and devices to produce coordination. Some used involvement in PIC meetings and a number used other meetings with related agencies. Others felt that informal, ad hoc discussions and meetings were most productive in terms of maintaining coordination. Personal contacts were viewed almost everywhere as essential to effective coordination.

RECOMMENDATION

Loosen up the concept of semi-annual meetings to encompass such things as associate PIC groups, sub-group meetings, newsletters, and the like. Require SDAs to address coordination concerns in the RFP stage when they are soliciting service providers. Require SDAs to demonstrate efforts to develop program coordination rather than specifying particular things they have to do.

Use of Existing Services and Facilities

The SDA must develop and maintain an inventory of job training and supportive services for use in program planning. The SDA must use existing publicly owned equipment, programs, or facilities whenever possible. Following these criteria should reduce duplication and increase the efficiency of job training and development activities.

Virtually all SDAs report preparing and using

inventories of existing services and facilities. The administrative entities and program operators find it to be useful in referring clients to auxiliary services and keeping track of services that are available.

RECOMMENDATION

Encourage SDAs to continue to produce and distribute the inventories of existing services. This can be used as a reference tool in helping clients and will help the JTPA program link with other agencies and programs. Updating the inventory will help the SDA insure that it is current on service delivery options.

Vocational Education

The SDA is to review and comment on applications by local vocational education agencies for Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act funds. These funds are intended to be used for virtually the same population as JTPA funds and can be used for the same types of activities.

We found little evidence that coordination of this type was taking place. Some AE directors told us they knew little about what was being done with Carl Perkins funds in their area. State officials expressed concern about the lack of interaction of Carl Perkins applications. Given the potential match between these two programs, efforts should be improved to produce coordination.

RECOMMENDATION

Procedures should be developed to insure coordination of Carl Perkins and JTPA activities. The agreement under development between DESE and DJDT should proceed.

Farmers/Rural Development

The SDA shall coordinate its efforts with local and county agencies to provide job training and employment services to farmers who are economically disadvantaged or have been dislocated from the farm.

PRODUCED BY
The Missouri Division of Job Development and Training
221 Metro Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65101